

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Among them, claim 1 has been amended. Support to the amendment to claim 1 can be found, e.g. in Figs 1-5, as well as at page 2, paragraph 2; and page 5, line 3 through page 6, line 3.

Claim 1 covers an elevator having a self-supporting shaft scaffold. The Examiner rejects claim 1, as well as claims 4-6, 7, 9, 11, 19-21 and 23 dependent from it, as being anticipated by Rompa, and also rejects claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 12-21 and 23 as being obvious over Rompa or further in view of additional references.

The Examiner contends that “[i]n regards to Rompa not teaching the vertical girders as providing the support for the elevator shaft, the limitations being argued are not in claim 1... Rompa does disclose a self-supporting elevator shaft as claimed in claim 1.” See paragraph 3, page 7 of the Office Action.

Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, now explicitly recites more limitations, including the limitation that vertical guidemembers, parts of a shaft scaffold, provide support to the shaft scaffold. The self-supporting shaft scaffold requires only two elements: (1) vertical segmental guide elements for an elevator cabin and for a counterweight, and (2) horizontal module-shaped mounting frames connected to the vertical segmental guide elements. The guide elements are not only vertical guideways for the counterweight and the elevator cabin, but also support the shaft scaffold. This self-supporting shaft scaffold is formed by connecting the vertical segmental guide elements with the horizontal module-shaped mounting frames.

The Examiner erred in contending that “Rompa does disclose a self-supporting elevator shaft as claimed in claim 1.” In the Rompa elevator, the guide members only serve as guideways for the lift and the counterweight and other elements are required to provide support to the shaft. See column 1, line 13 through line 24, “a lift... comprises a support [i.e., support beams 15, shown in Figs. 2-5, 9 and 11] adapted to be mounted against said wall so as to extend substantially vertically along said wall, a plurality of shaft sections adapted for unilateral mounting one above the other against said support so as to form a continuous shaft, guide members [4, shown in Figs. 1 and 11]... form a continuous guideway extending along side said support...” Also see column 1, line 38 through line 41; column 2, line 10 through line 15; and column 3, lines 7-11. Clearly, the shaft of the Rompa elevator is supported by support beams 15

mounted on the wall, not by guide members 4 of the shaft. Indeed, Rompa's shaft is not self-supporting, since the guide members do not provide both the guideways and support to the elevator. As Rompa does not teach an elevator including a self-supporting shaft scaffold of claim 1, it does not anticipate amended claim 1. Claims 4-6, 7, 9, 11, 19-21 and 23, all dependent from claim 1, are also not anticipated by Rompa.

Not only does Rompa fail to teach a self-supporting shaft scaffold recited in claim 1, it also does not suggest such a scaffold. Neither do the other prior art references cited by the Examiner. Therefore, their combination with Rompa, in any manner, does not make up for the deficiency of Rompa. In other words, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the prior art cited by the Examiner. Neither are claims 2, 3, 7, 9, 10, 12-21 and 23, all of which depend from claim 1.

Applicant submits that the claims of the invention, as now amended to more clearly recite Applicant's invention are fully distinguishable, not obvious and therefore patentable, over the cited prior art references. Early favorable action is solicited in this regard.